



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,085	03/26/2001	Johannes Andreas Zaat	NL 000160	9828

24737 7590 03/01/2004

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

PERRY, ANTHONY T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,085

Applicant(s)

ZAAT ET AL.

Examiner

Anthony T Perry

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on 12/01/03, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vause (US 3,885,186).

Regarding claims 4 and 2, Vause discloses an electric lamp in Fig. 1 which comprises a light-transmitting lamp vessel 12, an electrical element 11 in the lamp vessel 12 and current supply conductors 13,13a extending to the electric element 11. The lamp further comprises a lamp cap 15 connected to the lamp vessel 12, which has a shell portion 16 and a base portion 20 which each support an electric contact member 18. Each electric contact member 18 has a surface on which the respective current supply conductor 13 is fused to a solidified connection body 19. Vause teaches an aluminum alloy containing 12% by weight of silicon as being a suitable alloy for the solidified connection body 19 (col. 5, lines 15-20).

Regarding claim 3, the alloy mentioned in the rejection of claims 1 and 2 above, is an eutectic mixture of aluminum having approximately 12.5% by weight of silicon (col. 5, lines 15-20).

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 5, the solidified connection body consists essentially of aluminum and silicon.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGinley (US 1,650,289) in view of Timsit (US 5,190,596).

Regarding claims 2-5, the McGinley reference discloses an electric lamp in Fig. 1 which comprises a light-transmitting lamp vessel 10, an electrical element 19 in the lamp vessel 10 and current supply conductors 15,16 extending to the electric element 19. The lamp further comprises a lamp cap connected to the lamp vessel 10, which has a shell portion 24 and a base portion 20 which each support an electric contact member 21. Each electric contact member has a surface on which the respective current supply conductor 15,16 is fused to a solidified connection body 25,26. McGinley does not specifically state what type of metal the contact members of the lamp cap are made of. However, it is well known in the art to use lamp caps made of relatively inexpensive aluminum. McGinley does not specifically state what type of soldering material the solidified connection body comprises.

However, Timsit teaches a eutectic mixture of aluminum with an additive of about 12.5% by weight of silicone that is excellent for joining aluminum to metal surfaces (col. 4, lines 21-34). Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have used a

Art Unit: 2879

soldering alloy as taught by Timsit as the solidified connection body of McGinley reference so as to provide a secure reliable joint for connecting the supply conductors to their respective contact members.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see page 2 of the Response, filed 12/01/03, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 2-5 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection has been made.

The Examiner believes the Vause reference teaches that the conductor wire is fused to the connection body, in that the two components are fastened together through the use of heat and pressure. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary Tenth Edition defines the term fuse as "to stitch by applying heat and pressure with or without the use of an adhesive."

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Anthony Perry* whose telephone number is (571) 272-2459. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 9:00AM to 5:30PM Monday thru Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-24597. **The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.**

Art Unit: 2879

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [Anthony.perry@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.


ASHOK PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Anthony Perry
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879
February 2, 2004